


inventions necessarily distinct. For example, a reference that might anticipate or make obvious the invention of Claim 4 would not necessarily anticipate or make obvious the invention of Claim 5. These inventions of Claims 4-5 are not patentably distinct from each other even though they have differing limitations. The same applies for the inventions of Claims 13-23.

In view of the foregoing, Applicant believes the restriction/election requirement is improper and all claims should be examined in a single application.

Respectfully,

MILES & STOCKBRIDGE P.C.

By: 
Edward J. Kondracki
Reg. No. 20,604

1751 Pinnacle Drive, Suite 500
McLean, Virginia 22102-3833
Telephone: (703) 610-8627
#9229600v1